Minges, Allison

From: Stark, David

Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 3:36 PM

To: PSC_Contact

Subject: Fwd: [External] Dockets 2019-224-E and 2019-225-E [IMAN-CLIENTS.FID277621]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

From: Carrie Schurg <carrie@rlwhitt.law>
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 2:19:23 PM
To: Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: [External] Dockets 2019-224-E and 2019-225-E [IMAN-CLIENTS.FID277621]

This email was dictated by Richard Whitt:

David:

- 1. This email is responsive to Duke's counsel's email to you earlier this afternoon.
- 2. For the record, counsel's email is inaccurate and misleading. Counsel states that, "...the deadline for CCEBA to respond to DEC/DEP's Motion to Compel has passed...", implying that CCEBA has failed to respond to DEC/DEP's Motion. That implication is not true, and I call your attention to the Introduction to CCEBA's Motion for Protective Order. Specifically, CCEBA's Motion filed on March 18, 2021, contained the following language, "In addition to CCEBA's timely Objections to "Discovery Request 1", described below, this Motion for a Protective Order is also timely interposed as being responsive to DEC/DEP's Motion to Compel."
- 3. Therefore, counsel's email to you ignores CCEBA's timely Objections to the Discovery Requests, and counsel's email also ignores CCEBA's Motion for Protective Order, which was timely interposed as being responsive to DEC/DEP's Motion to Compel filed with the Commission on March 11, 2021, i.e., CCEBA's Motion was filed within 10-days of DEC/DEP's Motion, as required by this Commission's Rules and Regulations.
- 4. Finally, DEC/DEP's counsel's email asks this Commission to ignore CCEBA's due process rights and CCEBA's right to file a Reply to DEC/DEP's Response, as expressly allowed in this Commission's R. 103-829(A). This Commission should carry over Wednesday's Agenda item and allow CCEBA to respond within the five-day time frame from this Commission's Regulation.

Respectfully Submitted, Richard Whitt,

As Counsel for Carolinas Clean Energy Business Association.

From: Frank R. Ellerbe III <fellerbe@robinsongray.com>

Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 1:53 PM

To: Carrie Schurg <carrie@rlwhitt.law>; david.stark@psc.sc.gov <david.stark@psc.sc.gov>; rlwhitt@rlwhitt.law

<rl>hitt@rlwhitt.law></rl>

Cc: Heather Smith Cc: Heather Smith heather.smith@duke-energy.com; Rebecca J. Dulin Rebecca.Dulin@duke-energy.com; jnelson@ors.sc.gov <jnelson@ors.sc.gov>; Carri Grube-Lybarker Carri Grube-Lybarker Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Bateman, Andrew Andrew Andrew Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Bateman, Andrew Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Edwards, Nanette Carri Grube-Lybarker Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Bateman, Andrew Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Bateman, Andrew Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; jack.pringle@arlaw.com Aste Lee klee@selcsc.org>; Hall, Roger Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; jack.pringle@arlaw.com isom; kate Lee Klee@selcsc.org>; Hall, Roger Calybarker@scconsumer.gov>; jack.pringle@arlaw.com jack.pringle@arlaw.com; kate Lee klee@selcsc.org>; Hall, Roger Astenation:com isom; mailto:com; mailto:com; mailto:com; Richard Whitt richarde:com richarde:com; Richard Whitt ric

David:

I am sending this email to reply to the letter sent to you this morning by Richard Whitt in reference to Dockets 2019-224-E and 2019-225-E. As is reflected in our March 26th response to CCEBA's motion for a protective order, Duke filed a motion to compel on March 11th in these cases requesting that the Commission resolve the discovery dispute between CCEBA and DEC/DEP. Instead of responding to the DEC/DEP motion to compel, CCEBA filed a motion for a protective order. I would note that the deadline for CCEBA to respond to DEC/DEP's motion to compel has passed, and reiterate that responses to the discovery that has been propounded to CCEBA are necessary for DEC and DEP and their witnesses to prepare to testify at the hearing which is scheduled to begin less than a month from now. For that reason DEC and DEP have requested that the Commission either: (1) act expeditiously to reject the CCEBA motion for a protective order and grant the DEC/DEP motion to compel; or (2) schedule an oral argument on the motions on an expedited basis.

The discovery issues in dispute were first raised by the DEC/DEP motion to compel filed on March 11th. Those issues are ripe for resolution and should not be delayed for any further briefing.

Thank you for considering our position.

Frank



Litigation + Business

FRANK ELLERBE MEMBER

DIRECT 803.227.1112

ROBINSONGRAY.COM

1310 Gadsden Street PO Box 11449 (29211) Columbia, SC 29201









NOTICE: This e-mail is confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. If you received this message in error, please delete this message from your device.

Supporting Green print wisely.

From: Carrie Schurg <carrie@rlwhitt.law> Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 10:05 AM

To: david.stark@psc.sc.gov

Cc: Heather Smith Cc: Heather Smith Ccourt. Grube-Lybarker @scconsumer.gov>; Jamey Goldin google Com/; Weston Adams Cweston Adams Cweston Ada

Subject: Dockets 2019-224-E and 2019-225-E

This email was dictated by Richard Whitt:

David:

Please see the attached Request, which was e-filed in Dockets 2019-224-E and 2019-225-E, this morning.

Regards, Richard Whitt.